

Detailed Staff Comments
Springmill Trails PUD
Community Development Department | City of Westfield

This report includes the original comment letter (in black text) that was sent to the petitioner on January 31, 2011. At the end of each comment is a note in **red text**, describing how that specific comment was or was not addressed in the June 28, 2011 submittal of the PUD Ordinance. Notes in **red text with yellow highlighting** are items that the petitioner has agreed to modify before submitting for the August 1, 2011 APC meeting. Notes in **bold red text** are items that the APC may wish to have further discussion at the July 18, 2011 APC meeting. The items for further discussion have been summarized in the “Outstanding Issues for Consideration” exhibit.

GENERAL PUD COMMENTS:

1. These comments are provided by the Community Development Department in response to the PUD proposal received on December 3, 2010. We have attempted to be as thorough as possible. These comments also incorporate any comments received from Plan Commission members prior to the time of this report. These comments do not incorporate various comments received from the public. Those have been provided separately. – **Noted**
2. Westfield’s corporate counsel will need to sign off of the WHEREAS language included in the beginning of the proposal and other components of the document before adoption. – **Noted**
3. The PUD Ordinance should establish the underlying zoning classification for each district within the PUD. The underlying zoning classification should be one of the City’s existing zoning districts, which will serve as the default standards for the respective districts, unless modified by the PUD Ordinance. For the proposed districts, Staff suggests the following:
 - a. Residential District 1 = one of the SF districts (proposed standards are probably closest to SF-4) – **SF-4 listed as default**
 - b. Residential District 2 (Detached Lots) = one of the SF districts (proposed standards are probably closest to SF-5) – **SF-5 listed as default**
 - c. Residential District 2 = (Attached Dwellings) = SF-A – **SF-5 listed as default; SF-5 standards would cover most of the lot types included in this district. Separate standards for attached housing are included in the PUD text.**
 - d. Commercial District = EI – **EI listed as default**
 - e. Market Center District = GB – **GB listed as default**
 - f. Mixed Use (Business) = GB – **GB listed as default**
 - g. Mixed Use (Multi-Family) = MF-2 – **MF-2 listed as default**

4. This theme will be repeated throughout this report, but unless there is a good reason to deviate from the City's Zoning Ordinance, then the PUD Ordinance should default to the City's standards, list any exceptions, and include any further restrictions. Also, there is no need to list standards in the PUD Ordinance if they are the same as those in the Zoning Ordinance. The PUD Ordinance should only include standards that are different from the underlying Zoning Ordinance. – Noted
5. Check the document for formatting consistency. There are some places where Roman Numerals are used for Article numbers, but most of the time, Arabic Numerals (1, 2, 3...) are used. Please choose one style and use it consistently. – Document checked for formatting consistency.
6. Please provide an "Amenity Plan", as provided with the Eagletown PUD. – Amenity Plan included with re-submittal

PUD COMMENTS BY SECTION:

Section 1. Legislative Intent. Under item (ii), replace the word "used" with "uses". – Section removed

Section 2. Effect. In the last sentence of this paragraph, which starts, "This Springmill Trails PUD supersedes the Zoning Ordinance..." should be replaced with the following (or similar): "Development of the Real Estate shall be governed by the Zoning Ordinance, unless specifically modified by the terms of this Springmill Trails PUD Ordinance. When the standards of this Springmill Trails PUD Ordinance are found to be in conflict with other standards of the Zoning Ordinance, the Springmill Trails PUD Ordinance shall prevail." – Language added to Section 1

Section 3. Size of District. Twenty (20) percent flexibility is more than the City has typically allowed in PUDs. Fifteen (15) percent fluctuation is what the current Eagletown PUD allows. Fifteen (15) percent is a more typical amount. – Standard relocated to the different district sections. Standard changed to 15%.

Article 1. Definitions. Unless there is a good reason to deviate from the City's Zoning Ordinance, the City's definitions should serve as the PUD's default. There is no need to repeat the City's definitions in the PUD Ordinance. To the extent there are any deviations from the Zoning Ordinance, the PUD should list any exceptions, include any modifications to definitions, and provide new definitions when necessary.

7. Art Studio. This definition appears to either be incomplete or missing punctuation. Also, should the last word, "are" be "art"? Please review and revise as necessary. – Definition removed
13. Buffer Yard. The second sentence from the definition in the Zoning Ordinance is missing. Please explain. – Definition removed
31. Corner Break. How far does something have to offset/protrude to count as a corner break? Please clarify. Also, do the four extreme corners of the house count? Please clarify. – Definition clarified. The petitioner has agreed to establish a minimum offset of 2 feet.

43. Dwelling, Single Family Detached. This definition is out of order. It should appear after “Dwelling, Single Family Attached”. – Re-ordered appropriately
58. Floor Area, Gross Ground. This definition refers to residential buildings. Should it also consider non-residential buildings? Please review and revise as necessary. – Definition removed
90. Open/Green Space. This definition includes a lot of things that the City’s definition does not include. Please explain why this definition needs to be changed for this project. Consider defaulting to the City’s definition. – Definition removed. Defaults to the Zoning Ordinance.
126. Underlying Zoning Compendium. This definition can be deleted because it is not necessary since the Zoning Ordinance will not be “frozen in time” for this PUD. – Definition removed

Article 2. Land Use Controls. Unless there is a good reason to deviate from the City’s Zoning Ordinance, these standards should be included and serve as the PUD’s default standards. To the extent there are any deviations from the Zoning Ordinance, the PUD Ordinance should list any exceptions and include any further restrictions. This Article can probably be eliminated. – Section removed. Defaults to the Zoning Ordinance.

Article 3. Single Family Residential Districts

Section 3.1.A. Unless there is a good reason to deviate from the City’s Zoning Ordinance, the City’s standards for accessory structures should serve as the PUD’s default standards. There is no need to repeat the City’s standards in the PUD Ordinance. To the extent there are any deviations from the Zoning Ordinance, the PUD should list any exceptions and include any further restrictions. This Section can probably be deleted. – Section removed. Defaults to the Zoning Ordinance.

Section 3.1.B.1. Add the word “plat” after the word “subdivision”. – Section removed

Section 3.1.B.2. Add a comma after the term “through lot”. – Section removed

Section 3.1.B.3. Add a comma after the term “corner lot”. – Section removed

Section 3.1.D. Unless there is a good reason to deviate from the City’s Zoning Ordinance, the City’s standards for Home Occupations should serve as the PUD’s default standards. There is no need to repeat the City’s standards in the PUD Ordinance. To the extent there are any deviations from the Zoning Ordinance, the PUD should list any exceptions and include any further restrictions. This Section can probably be deleted. – Section removed. Defaults to the Zoning Ordinance.

Section 3.1.F. Unless there is a good reason to deviate from the City’s Zoning Ordinance, the City’s standards for fences should serve as the PUD’s default standards. There is no need to repeat the City’s standards in the PUD Ordinance. To the extent there are any deviations from

the Zoning Ordinance, the PUD should list any exceptions and include any further restrictions. This Section can probably be deleted. – Section removed. Defaults to the Zoning Ordinance.

Section 3.1.G. Unless there is a good reason to deviate from the City’s Zoning Ordinance, the City’s standards for swimming pools should serve as the PUD’s default standards. There is no need to repeat the City’s standards in the PUD Ordinance. To the extent there are any deviations from the Zoning Ordinance, the PUD should list any exceptions and include any further restrictions. This Section can probably be deleted. – Section removed. Defaults to the Zoning Ordinance.

Section 3.1.H. Unless there is a good reason to deviate from the City’s infrastructure standards, the City’s standards for internal and perimeter sidewalks should serve as the PUD’s default standards. There is no need to repeat the City’s standards in the PUD Ordinance. To the extent there are any deviations from the Zoning Ordinance, the PUD should list any exceptions and include any further restrictions. This Section can probably be deleted. – Section removed. Defaults to the Zoning Ordinance.

Section 3.2. Residential District 1. The “Zone Map” does not distinguish specific districts within each PUD. It is suggested to delete the last sentence because it is a bit confusing and unnecessary because it was already addressed in the WHEREAS language. – Sentence deleted

Section 3.2.A.5. Concession/Mobility Rental Stand. The Plan Commission may wish to discuss if this is an appropriate use in the Residential District 1 area. – Item removed from permitted use list

Section 3.2.A.8. Accessory buildings as related to single family residential uses. Accessory buildings are not land uses and should not be included in a list of “Permitted Uses”. Suggest deleting. – Item removed from permitted use list

Section 3.2.A.9. Temporary buildings and job site trailers for construction purposes.... Temporary buildings/trailers are not land uses and should not be included in a list of “Permitted Uses”. Suggest deleting. – Item removed from permitted use list

Section 3.2.A.11. Signs as permitted by this Springmill Trails PUD Ordinance. Signs are not land uses and should not be included in a list of “Permitted Uses”. Suggest deleting. – Item removed from permitted use list

Section 3.2.A.12. All utilities, both regulated and unregulated (excludes offices and/or storage facilities). Utilities are not land uses and should not be included in a list of “Permitted Uses”. Suggest deleting. – Item removed from permitted use list

Section 3.2.A.15. Common Areas. Remove the phrase, “as specified in any Declaration”, located at the end of the paragraph. – Phrase removed

Section 3.2.A.16 Any amenity structure or facility..... This seems like something that should be found in Covenants, Conditions & Restrictions, not a PUD Ordinance. Suggest deleting. – Item removed from permitted use list

Section 3.2.A.17. The keeping of horses and associated accessory structures on lots greater than or equal to 3 acres in area. Accessory structures are not land uses. Suggest relocating this to a section that addresses accessory structures. Also, what are the standards/setback requirements for the accessory structures? The City's setback requirement is 200 feet from each property line. Is it the intent that the 200-foot setback standard apply in this PUD Ordinance? – Section relocated to the "General Requirements" section of the Residential Districts article. Standards established. The petitioner has agreed to clarify the standard further by limiting the allowable animals to horses, ponies and llamas.

Section 3.2.A.18. Artificial Lakes and Ponds. Lakes and ponds are not land uses and should not be included in a list of "Permitted Uses". Suggest deleting. – Item removed from permitted use list

Section 3.2.B. Under the current Eagletown PUD, the land (now being called "Residential District 1") is divided into three (3) residential districts. Each of the districts has a different minimum lot size requirement, ranging from 7,500 square feet to 11,000 square feet. The proposal consolidates the three (3) residential districts into a single district, which as proposed has a minimum lot size of 7,500 square feet. The proposed 7,500 square foot Minimum Lot Area standard falls between the City's SF-4 (9,000) and SF-5 (7,000) standards. The current Eagletown PUD assured some variety in lot and home sizes in this area. It is suggested that variety in lot and home sizes is preferable to the alternative of possibly having 267 acres of the same lot and house size. It is also suggested that it is preferable to have lots that are larger than 7,500 square feet in this district. What can be included in the Springmill Trails PUD to ensure a variety of lot sizes and home sizes will occur in this residential area? The Plan Commission may wish to discuss this item further. – Variety built into the PUD language. Minimum lot size = 7,500 square feet. Maximum number of lots less than 9,000 square feet = 400 lots. Maximum number of lots less than 11,000 square feet = 600 lots. This guarantees that if more than 400 lots are developed in Residential District 1, then there will be lots that are 9,000 square feet or greater. This also guarantees that if more than 600 lots are developed in Residential District 1, there will be lots that are 11,000 square feet or greater.

Section 3.2.D.1.

- The proposed definition of having two (2) front yards on corner lots is different than the City's definition. The City's Zoning Ordinance defines corner lots as having one (1) front lot line (the narrower of the two), and therefore one (1) front yard. Unless there is a good reason to deviate from the City's definition of front lot line/yard, the City's

standard definitions should serve as the PUD's default standards. – Note regarding corner lots removed. Defaults to Zoning Ordinance.

- It has been suggested to consider a front yard setback for garages which is behind the front plane of the house. – Front yard setbacks for garages may be a discussion item at the APC meeting.

Section 3.2.G. See discussion above (Section 3.2.B) regarding minimum home sizes. – Variety built into the PUD language. Maximum number of dwellings less than 1,600 square feet if single story and 2,000 square feet if two-story = 400 dwellings. Maximum number of dwellings less than 2,000 square feet = 600 dwellings. This guarantees that if more than 400 dwellings are built in Residential District 1, then there will be single-family dwellings that are 1,600 square feet or greater and two-story dwellings that are 2,000 square feet or greater. This also guarantees that if more than 600 dwellings are built in Residential District 1, there will be dwellings that are 2,000 square feet or greater.

Section 3.2.G.2. Is the stated minimum square footage for a two-story intended to be a total square footage or a ground floor square footage? Please clarify. – Clarified to apply to the “total” square footage

Section 3.2.H. What is included in calculating the maximum parcel coverage? Does it include structures only, or does it include driveways, sidewalks, and other impervious surfaces? Also, the City's Zoning Ordinance does not have this standard for single-family residential lots. Please explain the benefit of including this standard in the PUD Ordinance. – Section removed.

Section 3.2.J.

- The term “home” is used throughout the PUD Ordinance, but is not defined. Please either define this term or use another term that is already defined. – Language changed from “home” to “dwelling” throughout the PUD
- The current Eagletown PUD requires a minimum number of side, courtyard, or rear-load garages. Please consider putting a similar standard into the Springmill Trails PUD. As discussed in more depth below, it is desirable to have a variety of homes and home sites within this area, and a requirement for a minimum number of side, courtyard, or rear-load garages would help achieve that goal. – Minimum number of dwellings having a side-load or courtyard garage = 72 dwellings
- For homes that are adjacent to an arterial, consider requiring their front to face the arterial or provide some other heightened buffer/screening standards. – Lots adjacent to arterials are required to either face the arterial, or be separated from the arterial by a minimum of 100 feet of open space.

Section 3.2.J.1.c. Vinyl siding is currently only allowed on a maximum of twenty-five (25) percent of any elevation, according to the City's Zoning Ordinance. The proposed use of vinyl siding in the Springmill Trails PUD would allow more coverage than twenty-five (25) percent.

The Plan Commission may wish to discuss this difference. – Vinyl siding is not permitted in Residential District 1

It is suggested that breaking up long expanses of vinyl siding (on all sides of a building) with elements such as corner breaks and windows is desirable. Subsequent sections of this PUD Ordinance may need to be revisited to ensure that long expanses of vinyl siding will be adequately broken up. This can be done by adding corner breaks, windows, or perhaps other architectural treatments. Also, what assurances can be put into the PUD Ordinance that vinyl siding will be installed correctly, so as to minimize warping and other disfiguring? – Windows are required on all sides, to address concerns with blank walls. Installation concerns are no longer applicable to Residential District 1.

At the Plan Commission meeting, the petitioner should be prepared to discuss the proposed thickness and how it compares to the average vinyl siding being used today (if possible, bringing samples for the Plan Commission to see would be helpful). – No longer applicable to Residential District 1

Section 3.2.J.4. Outside of the definitions section, this is the first use of the term “façade” in the PUD Ordinance. The use of the term “façade” in the Zoning Ordinance is creating confusion when using the term elsewhere in other City projects. As a result, the City is in the process of amending the Zoning Ordinance so that when the term “façade” is used, it will be replaced with the term “elevation”. Please consider making this change throughout the Springmill Trails PUD Ordinance as well. – Language changed from “façade” to “elevation” throughout the PUD

Section 3.2.J.3. As discussed above (Section 3.2.J.1.c), it is suggested that “blank” walls are undesirable. It has been suggested that adding corner breaks, windows, and perhaps some other architectural treatment(s) on all sides of a home, especially if vinyl siding is used, would be desirable. The current Eagletown PUD requires corner breaks on the sides; please consider requiring a minimum number of corner breaks to all sides of homes within the Springmill Trails PUD. – Windows are required on all sides, to address concerns with blank walls. The petitioner has agreed to include language that requires 3 corner breaks on the side elevations, which is the same standard found in the residential district standards in the existing Eagletown PUD.

Section 3.2.J.4.b. This standard would only appear to apply to corner lots (as defined by the City). It is suggested that having “blank” walls on these homes is undesirable. Please consider requiring a minimum number of windows on all sides of the building. Also, delete the word “the” in the sentence. – By removing the “corner lot” note above, windows are now required on each side of the dwelling

Section 3.2.J.4.d. Please include a minimum width for a “double window”. – Clarified to mean, “a single window unit a minimum of four (4) feet in width with two windows side-by-side”

Section 3.2.J.4.e.

- The term “architectural treatment” is used in the first sentence. Please define. – Clarified by using the language “treatment” instead of “architectural treatment”
- Delete the word “either” in the first sentence. – The petitioner has agreed to make the change.
- In the third sentence, what is meant by the treatments being made of “natural materials”? Please explain/clarify. – “Naturals Materials” is a defined term in Article 1 of the PUD

Section 3.2.J.7. Are overhangs required elements? It appears that this standard applies if a structure has overhangs, but does not specifically require them. Is that the intent? Please explain/clarify. – Clarified so that overhangs are required

Section 3.2.J.8. Delete the word “half” in the first sentence. Replace the word “will” with “shall” in the second sentence. – Changes made

Section 3.2.J.9. The proposed anti-monotony standard is minimal. Please consider increasing this standard. Staff can provide an example, if desired. – Increased standard proposed (found in Section 2.5, D)

Section 3.2.J.10. Staff suggests deleting this section of the ordinance. The Director already has the responsibility of interpreting and applying the ordinance. It is suggested that a better practice would be for the City Council to approve deviations from the ordinance rather than City Staff. – Section removed

Section 3.2.K.

- Do the Lot Landscaping Requirements count towards the required “On-Site” landscaping requirements (found in the Landscaping Standards)? Please explain/clarify. – Language clarified so that these landscaping standards contribute to the landscaping requirements found in Section 8.2 of the PUD Ordinance
- The side yard planting requirements found in the current Eagletown PUD were not included in the Springmill Trails PUD. Please explain why they were not included. – Side yard planting requirements added to the re-submittal

Section 3.2.K.1. How do these shade tree requirements work with the required “Road Frontage” shade tree requirements (found in the Landscaping Standards)? Please explain/clarify. – Language clarified so that these landscaping standards contribute to the landscaping requirements found in Section 8.2 of the PUD Ordinance

Section 3.2.K.2. The two (2) foot continuous mulch bed seems like something that should be found in Covenants, Conditions & Restrictions, not a PUD Ordinance. This will likely be very difficult for the City to enforce. Suggest deleting. – Section removed

Section 3.3. Residential District 2. The “Zone Map” does not distinguish specific districts within each PUD. It is suggested to delete the last sentence because it is a bit confusing and unnecessary because it was already addressed in the WHEREAS language. – Sentence deleted

Section 3.3.A.4. Accessory buildings as related to single family residential uses. Accessory buildings are not land uses and should not be included in a list of “Permitted Uses”. Suggest deleting. – Item removed from permitted use list

Section 3.3.A.6. Concession/Mobility Rental Stand. The Plan Commission may wish to discuss if this is an appropriate use in the Residential District 1 area. – The petitioner has agreed to limit this use to the area west of Eagle Parkway, which is where it is permitted under the current Eagletown PUD.

Section 3.3.A.7. Temporary buildings and job site trailers for construction purposes... Temporary buildings/trailers are not land uses and should not be included in a list of “Permitted Uses”. Suggest deleting. – Item removed from permitted use list

Section 3.3.A.9. Signs as permitted by this Springmill Trails PUD Ordinance. Signs are not land uses and should not be included in a list of “Permitted Uses”. Suggest deleting. – Item removed from permitted use list

Section 3.3.A.10. All utilities, both regulated and unregulated (excludes offices and/or storage facilities). Utilities are not land uses and should not be included in a list of “Permitted Uses”. Suggest deleting. – Item removed from permitted use list

Section 3.3.A.13. Common Areas. Remove the phrase, “as specified in any Declaration”, located at the end of the paragraph. – Phrase removed

Section 3.3.A.14. Any amenity structure or facility... This seems like something that should be found in Covenants, Conditions & Restrictions, not a PUD Ordinance. Suggest deleting. – Item removed from permitted use list

Section 3.3.A.15. The keeping of horses and associated accessory structures on lots greater than or equal to 3 acres in area. Accessory structures are not land uses. Suggest relocating this to a section that addresses accessory structures. Also, what are the standards/setback requirements for the accessory structures? The City’s setback requirement is 200 feet from each property line. Is it the intent that the 200-foot setback standard apply in this PUD Ordinance? – See comment above regarding this item

Section 3.3.A.16. Artificial Lakes and Ponds. Lakes and ponds are not land uses and should not be included in a list of “Permitted Uses”. Suggest deleting. – Item removed from permitted use list

Section 3.3.B.6-3.3.N.

- Please provide pictures and examples of how these lots and homes will look. – **Examples have been provided**
- The “45’ front load lot” was not included in the Eagletown PUD. The proposed standards for this lot type are new. The Plan Commission may wish to discuss this further. – **Noted**
- Unless there is a good reason to deviate from the City’s SF-A standards, the City’s standards for SF-A developments should serve as the PUDs default standards. There is no need to repeat the City’s standards in the PUD Ordinance. To the extent there are any deviations from the Zoning Ordinance, the PUD should list any exceptions and include any further restrictions. Please explain any proposed differences from the City’s existing SF-A standards. – **Residential District 2 defaults to SF-5. SF-5 standards would cover most of the lot types included in this district. Separate standards for attached housing are included in the PUD text.**

Section 3.3.D. Do the setbacks apply to accessory structures too? The City is currently in the process of amending its setback requirements for accessory structures. Please consider defaulting to the City’s standards regarding this issue. Suggest deleting the note “(all construction)”. – **Note removed. Defaults to the Zoning Ordinance.**

Section 3.3.D.1.

- The proposed definition of having two (2) front yards on corner lots is different than the City’s definition. The City’s Zoning Ordinance defines corner lots as having one (1) front lot line (the narrower of the two), and therefore one (1) front yard. Unless there is a good reason to deviate from the City’s definition of front lot line/yard, the City’s standard definitions should serve as the PUDs default standards. – **Note regarding corner lots removed. Defaults to Zoning Ordinance.**
- It has been suggested to consider a front yard setback for garages which is behind the front plane of the house. – **Front yard setbacks for garages may be a discussion item at the APC meeting.**

Section 3.3.D.2.f. The proposed minimum distance between structures for a Single Family Attached Dwelling is fifteen (15) feet. That is less than the standard found in the City’s SF-A District, which is twenty-five (25) feet for structures without vinyl siding and thirty (30) feet for structures with vinyl siding. Please explain why the City’s standard needs to be modified for this project. – **Language was modified from 15 feet between structures to 20 feet between structures. The separation between single-family attached dwellings may be a discussion item at the APC meeting.**

Section 3.3.D.3.f. See comment above regarding minimum distance between structures for a Single Family Attached Dwelling. – **Language was modified from 15 feet between structures to**

20 feet between structures. The separation between single-family attached dwellings may be a discussion item at the APC meeting.

Section 3.3.D.5.f.

- The proposed maximum building height for a detached dwelling in this district is thirty-five (35) feet. That is more than the standard found in the City's SF-3, SF-4 and SF-5 Districts, which is twenty-five (25) feet. Please explain why the proposed height is thirty-five (35) feet. – **The maximum building height of single-family detached dwellings may be a discussion item at the APC meeting.**
- The proposed maximum building height for a Single Family Attached Dwelling is forty-five (45) feet. That is more than the standard found in the City's SF-A District, which is thirty-five (35) feet. Please explain why the City's standard will need to be modified for this project. – **The maximum building height of single-family attached dwellings may be a discussion item at the APC meeting.**

Section 3.3.D.6. Is the minimum square footage standard for ground floor only, or is it for the total dwelling? Please clarify. – **Clarified to apply to the "total" square footage**

Section 3.3.D.6.a. The proposed minimum square footage for a single-story is 1,250 square feet. That is less than the current Eagletown PUD requirement, which is 1,400 square feet. Please explain the reason for the decrease. Also, what assurance can be added to the Springmill Trails PUD that there will be a variety of lots and home sizes built in this district? – **Language was modified so that single-story dwellings west of Eagle Parkway = a minimum of 1,400 square feet; and single-story dwellings east of Eagle Parkway = a minimum of 1,500 square feet. Variety in home size concern addressed by establishing different minimums on either side of Eagle Parkway.**

Section 3.3.D.6.b. The proposed minimum square footage for a two-story is 1,500 square feet. That is less than the current Eagletown PUD requirement, which is 1,800 square feet. Please explain the reason for the decrease. Also, what assurance can be added to the Springmill Trails PUD that there will be a variety of lots and home sizes built in this district? – **Language was modified so that two-story dwellings west of Eagle Parkway = a minimum of 1,500 square feet; and two-story dwellings east of Eagle Parkway = a minimum of 1,800 square feet. Variety in home size concern addressed by establishing different minimums on either side of Eagle Parkway. The square footage for the two-story dwellings west of Eagle Parkway may be a discussion item at the APC meeting.**

Section 3.3.D.6.c. The proposed minimum square footage for a Single Family Attached dwelling is 700 square feet. That is less than the standards found in the City's SF-A District, which are 1,300 square feet for a single-story; 1,600 square feet for a story-and-a-half; and 1,800 square feet for a two-story. Please explain why the City's standard needs to be modified for this project. – **Language was modified so that single-family attached dwellings west of Eagle Parkway = a minimum of 1,350 square feet; and single-family attached dwellings east of Eagle Parkway = a minimum of 1,500 square feet.**

Parkway = a minimum of 1,500 square feet. The square footage for the single-family attached dwellings may be a discussion item at the APC meeting.

Section 3.3.G. What is included in calculating the maximum parcel coverage? Does it include structures only, or does it include driveways, sidewalks, and other impervious surfaces? Also, the City's Zoning Ordinance does not have this standard for single-family residential lots. Please explain the benefit of including this standard in the PUD Ordinance. – Section removed

Section 3.3.I.

- Do the "Architectural Standards" requirements apply to single-family detached and single-family attached dwellings? The term "home" is used throughout the PUD Ordinance, but is not defined, and is creating confusion in this Section. Please either define this term or use other terms that are already defined (i.e. "Single Family Detached Dwelling" and "Single Family Attached Dwelling"). – The standards apply to both, attached and detached dwellings. And as mentioned above, the term "home" replaced with the term "dwelling" throughout the PUD.
- For homes that are adjacent to an arterial, consider requiring their front to face the arterial or provide some other heightened buffer/screening standards. – Lots adjacent to arterials are required to either face the arterial, or be separated from the arterial by a minimum of 100 feet of open space.

Section 3.3.I.1.c. Vinyl siding is currently only allowed on a maximum of twenty-five (25) percent of any elevation, according to the City's Zoning Ordinance. The proposed use of vinyl siding in the Springmill Trails PUD would allow more coverage than twenty-five (25) percent. The Plan Commission may wish to discuss this difference. – Vinyl siding is not permitted on dwellings within 300 feet of Eagle Parkway or 186th Street. On dwellings where vinyl would be allowed, it can cover up to 50% of the elevation. The minimum thickness of vinyl siding allowed was increased from 0.044 mil to 0.048 mil.

It is suggested that breaking up long expanses of vinyl siding (on all sides of a building) with elements such as corner breaks and windows is desirable. Subsequent sections of this PUD Ordinance may need to be revisited to ensure that long expanses of vinyl siding will be adequately broken up. This can be done by adding corner breaks, windows, or perhaps other architectural treatments. Also, what assurances can be put into the PUD Ordinance that vinyl siding will be installed correctly, so as to minimize warping and other disfiguring? – Windows are required on all sides, to address concerns with blank walls. The petitioner has agreed to include vinyl installation requirements to the PUD.

At the Plan Commission meeting, the petitioner should be prepared to discuss the proposed thickness and how it compares to the average vinyl siding being used today (if possible, bringing samples for the Plan Commission to see would be helpful). – Noted

Section 3.3.1.2. Please reformat as follows (or similar): – Reformatted

1. Minimum Number of Ridge Lines:
 - i. Single Family Detached Buildings = 3
 - ii. Single Family Attached Buildings = 4

Section 3.3.1.3. Please reformat as follows (or similar): – Reformatted

2. Minimum Number of Corner Breaks on Front Elevation:
 - i. Single Family Detached Buildings = 3
 - ii. Single Family Attached Buildings = 0 (*NOTE – please explain why there are no corner breaks required on SF-A buildings. As discussed in previous sections, it is suggested that breaking up these elevations is desirable, especially if vinyl siding is being used. The Plan Commission may wish to discuss this further.*)
– Language modified so that 3 corner breaks are required on the front of single-family detached dwellings; and 4 corner breaks are required on single-family attached dwellings

Section 3.3.1.4.b. This standard would only appear to apply to corner lots (as defined by the City). It is suggested that having “blank” walls on these homes is undesirable. Please consider requiring a minimum number of windows on all sides of the building. – Windows are required on all sides of a dwelling

Section 3.3.1.4.d. Please include a minimum width for a “double window”. – Clarified to mean, “a single window unit a minimum of four (4) feet in width with two windows side-by-side”

Section 3.3.1.4.e. The term “architectural treatment” is used in the first sentence. Please define. Also, delete the word “either” in the first sentence. – Clarified by using the language “treatment” instead of “architectural treatment”. The petitioner has agreed to delete the word “either”.

Section 3.3.1.7. Are overhangs required elements? It appears that this standard applies if a structure has overhangs, but does not specifically require them. Is that the intent? Please explain/clarify. – Clarified so that overhangs are required

Section 3.3.1.8. Delete the word “half” in the first sentence. Replace the word “will” with “shall” in the second sentence. – Changes made

Section 3.3.1.9. The proposed anti-monotony standard is minimal. Please consider increasing this standard. Staff can provide an example, if desired. – Increased standard proposed (found in Section 2.5, D)

Section 3.3.1.10. Staff suggests deleting this section of the ordinance. The Director already has the responsibility of interpreting and applying the ordinance. It is suggested that a better practice

would be for the City Council to approve deviations from the ordinance rather than City Staff. –
Section removed

Section 3.3.J. Do the Lot Landscaping Requirements count towards the required “On-Site” landscaping requirements (found in the Landscaping Standards)? Please explain/clarify. Also, check the formatting/numbering in this section, it appears that there two items numbered 4. –
Language clarified so that these landscaping standards contribute to the landscaping requirements found in Section 8.2 of the PUD Ordinance. Formatting corrected.

Section 3.3.J.1. How do these shade tree requirements work with the required “Road Frontage” shade tree requirements (found in the Landscaping Standards)? Please explain/clarify. –
Language clarified so that these landscaping standards contribute to the landscaping requirements found in Section 8.2 of the PUD Ordinance

Section 3.3.J.2. The two (2) foot continuous mulch bed seems like something that should be found in Covenants, Conditions & Restrictions, not a PUD Ordinance. This will likely be very difficult for the City to enforce. Suggest deleting. – Section removed

Section 3.3.J.4. Do these planting requirements replace the “On-Site” requirements (found in the Landscaping Standards)? Please explain/clarify. – Language clarified so that these landscaping standards contribute to the landscaping requirements found in Section 8.2 of the PUD Ordinance

Section 3.3.M.

- Define the term “dwelling type”. – Term defined as “front load detached, alley load detached, attached dwelling, etc.”
- The proposed standard would allow up to seventy (70) percent of all dwellings in the Residential District 2 to be a single “type”. The Plan Commission may wish to discuss this in further detail to determine if this is the appropriate ratio for this district. – This standard is unchanged from the existing Eagletown PUD ordinance, and may be a discussion item at the APC meeting.

Section 3.3.N. This standard is confusing. What is its intent? Please clarify. – Clarified by defining the term “dwelling type”

Section 3.4.A. Amenities.

- Delete the phrase, “for use by residents of districts designated by the Developer.” It is not necessary to put this in the PUD Ordinance. – Phrase removed
- The standard states that the amenities will be distributed throughout the “Real Estate”. Should it refer only to Residential Districts 1 and 2? If it really is intended that these be distributed throughout the entire Real Estate, then this Section should not be in the Residential Districts article (Article 3). – Language clarified so that the amenities

requirements apply to both Residential District 1 and Residential District 2, not the entire PUD. Language also modified to refer to the Amenity Plan (Exhibit E).

- The Plan Commission may wish to discuss if three (3) small parks, three (3) swimming pools, and three (3) playgrounds are enough to serve these residential areas (Residential District 1 plus Residential District 2 equals approximately 500 acres). – Minimum requirements increased to five (5) small parks, four (4) swimming pools, and five (5) playgrounds
- It has been suggested that development standards for the various amenities should be developed and included in the PUD Ordinance? – Standards for amenities default to the Zoning Ordinance
- Check the formatting/numbering of this section, it jumps from 1 to 3. – Formatting corrected

Section 3.4.B. The standard requires at least two (2) amenities within each residential district. This is the same standard from the existing Eagletown PUD, which had more residential districts. The net result is a total decrease in the number of required amenities throughout the PUD because there are three (3) less residential districts in the Springmill Trails PUD proposal. The Plan Commission may wish to discuss this further. – Language modified to require at least four (4) amenities in each residential district

Section 3.4.C. The proposed standard requires that the amenities be installed no later than the completion of fifty (50) percent of the dwellings within each district. Recent discussions on other projects have resulted in amenities being completed/installed sooner than later. The Plan Commission may wish to discuss this further. The timing of amenity installation may be a discussion item at the APC meeting.

Article 4. Commercial Districts.

- The “Zone Map” does not distinguish specific districts within each PUD. It is suggested to delete the last sentence because it is a bit confusing and unnecessary because it was already addressed in the WHEREAS language. – Sentence modified to eliminate reference to the Zone Map changing
- It is suggested that the new SR 32 Overlay Zone standards (which are currently being finalized) supersede the requirements found in this section regarding setbacks, architectural standards, and other development standards. It may make sense to adopt the new SR 32 Overlay standards before approving the Springmill Trails PUD. Then, the proposed PUD Ordinance can be modified as necessary to accommodate the new SR 32 Overlay standards. The Plan Commission may wish to discuss this further. – PUD defaults to the State Highway 32 Overlay Zone standards. Also, new standard included which would not allow the Commercial District to be within 350 feet of State Road 32 right-of-way.

Section 4.1.A. It is suggested that the eighty (80) percent rule is confusing. For example, what happens to the remaining twenty (20) percent of the required parking spaces? Please explain and clarify this section. – Section removed

Section 4.1.E. Allowing buildings to be taller as they are set further back from the right-of-way conflicts with the new SR 32 Overlay Zone standards (which are currently being finalized), where buildings are encouraged to be closer to the street. Please consider modifying or deleting this standard and adopting the new SR 32 Overlay Zone’s approach. – Section removed

Section 4.1.I. Should vending machines be addressed in this section too? – Section removed

Section 4.1.J. What is the width and material of the “pedestrian walkways” and “sidewalks” that are required? Please clarify. Also, is “adjacent” the right word choice in the last sentence? Please explain/clarify. – Language clarified, requiring pedestrian connections to be made between buildings and parking lots using striping or sidewalks. The petitioner has agreed to include a minimum pedestrian walkway and pathway width of five (5) feet.

Section 4.2.A.2. Please propose standards and restrictions for outdoor storage. The Plan Commission may wish to discuss this item further. – Language for screening outdoor storage areas proposed, requiring solid opaque screen around the storage area. The proposed standards did not include a minimum height requirement for the screen.

Section 4.2.B.2. This sentence is awkwardly worded. Please consider reworking it. – Sentence removed

Section 4.2.E. The proposed standard is for “Minimum Development Plan Frontage on Road. Should it be “Minimum Tract Frontage on Road”? Please explain/clarify. – Modified the language from “Minimum Development Plan Frontage on Road” to “Minimum Tract Frontage on Road”

Section 4.2.F.

- It is suggested that the new SR 32 Overlay Zone’s development standards (which are currently being finalized) be followed in this project. Please see the discussion above (Article 4, Bullet 2) regarding the inclusion of the new SR 32 Overlay Zone’s standards in this PUD. – PUD defaults to the State Highway 32 Overlay Zone standards. Also, new standard included which would not allow the Commercial District to be within 350 feet of State Road 32 right-of-way. Modification to the language establishes a 20 foot setback around the perimeter of the entire Commercial District.
- Suggest deleting the notes “(zero (0) feet for interior lot lines)” in this section. It is unnecessary to include these notes because it is already established that the setback lines apply to the perimeter of the district. – Notes deleted

Section 4.2.F.1.a. Delete the note “(as measured from the existing right-of-way at the time of adoption of the Springmill Trails PUD)”. – Note deleted

Section 4.2.F.1.b. Check the formatting. Everywhere else in this section, numbers are formatted like this example: “Twenty (20)”. – **Formatting changed**

Section 4.2.G. It is suggested that the new SR 32 Overlay Zone’s development standards (which are currently being finalized) be followed in this project. Please see the discussion above (Article 4, Bullet 2) regarding the inclusion of the new SR 32 Overlay Zone’s standards in this PUD. – **Language modified to remove reference to proximity to State Road 32. Standards defaults to GB building height standard.**

Section 4.2.H.1. It is suggested that this proposed standard be deleted because it will be addressed in the new SR 32 Overlay Zone standards. – **Section removed**

Section 4.3. Architectural Standards. It is suggested that the new SR 32 Overlay Zone’s architectural standards (which are currently being finalized) be followed in this project. Please see the discussion above (Article 4, Bullet 2) regarding the inclusion of the new SR 32 Overlay Zone’s standards in this PUD. – **Architectural standards established because a portion of the Commercial District falls outside of the State Highway 32 Overlay Zone.**

Section 4.3.A. The architectural standards included in this section are minimal. The Plan Commission may wish to discuss this further. – **Building materials standards default to the Zoning Ordinance**

Section 4.3.A.2. The standards says that “Wall sconces should be decorative...”. Should it say, “Wall sconces shall be decorative...”? Please confirm. – **Change made**

Section 4.3.A.3. Define the terms “architectural theme” and “design vocabulary”. What are the standards that apply? – **Terms removed, standard clarified.**

Section 4.3.B. Add a comma after the word “glass”. Change the word “and” to “or”. – **Language removed. Defaults to the Zoning Ordinance.**

Article 5. Business Districts.

Section 5.1.D. Delete the phrase “in business districts”. – **The petitioner has agreed to remove the phrase.**

Section 5.1.E. Allowing buildings to be taller as they are set further back from the right-of-way conflicts with the new SR 32 Overlay Zone standards (which are currently being finalized), where buildings are encouraged to be closer to the street. Please consider modifying or deleting this standard and adopting the new SR 32 Overlay Zone’s approach. – **Section removed**

Section 5.1.H. There are not any standards proposed for “permanent outside sales display” in the Market Center District. The Plan Commission may wish to discuss this item further. Also, should vending machines be addressed in this section too? – Screening requirement added, but no height or materials standards were included.

Section 5.1.J. What is the width and material of the “pedestrian walkways” and “sidewalks” that are required? Please clarify. Also, is “adjacent” the right word choice in the last sentence? Please explain/clarify. – Language clarified, requiring pedestrian connections to be made between buildings and parking lots using striping or sidewalks. The petitioner has agreed to include a minimum pedestrian walkway and pathway width of five (5) feet.

Section 5.2. Market Center District.

- The “Zone Map” does not distinguish specific districts within each PUD. It is suggested to delete the last sentence because it is a bit confusing and unnecessary because it was already addressed in the WHEREAS language. – Phrase removed
- It is suggested that the new SR 32 Overlay Zone standards (which are currently being finalized) supersede the requirements found in this section regarding setbacks, architectural standards, and other development standards. It may make sense to adopt the new SR 32 Overlay standards before approving the Springmill Trails PUD. Then, the proposed PUD Ordinance can be modified as necessary to accommodate the new SR 32 Overlay standards. The Plan Commission may wish to discuss this further. – PUD defaults to the State Highway 32 Overlay Zone standards.

Section 5.2.E. The proposed standard is for “Minimum Development Plan Frontage on Road. Should it be “Minimum Tract Frontage on Road”? Please explain/clarify. – The petitioner has agreed to make the change.

Section 5.2.F.

- It is suggested that the new SR 32 Overlay Zone’s development standards (which are currently being finalized) be followed in this project. Please see the discussion above (Article 4, Bullet 2) regarding the inclusion of the new SR 32 Overlay Zone’s standards in this PUD. – PUD defaults to the State Highway 32 Overlay Zone standards, with some modifications
- Suggest deleting the notes “(zero (0) feet for interior lot lines)” in this section. It is unnecessary to include these notes because it is already established that the setback lines apply to the perimeter of the district. – Notes deleted

Section 5.2.F.1.

- Delete the note “(as measured from the existing right-of-way at the time of adoption of the Springmill Trails PUD)”. – Note deleted

- Check the formatting. Everywhere else in this section, numbers are formatted like this example: “Eighty (80)”. – **Formatting modified**
- Please reformat as follows (or similar): – **Reformatted**
 - a. Eighty (80) feet along SR 32
 - b. Forty (40) feet along Eagle Parkway (Ditch Road extension)
 - c. Twenty (20) feet along all other streets

Section 5.2.G. It is suggested that the new SR 32 Overlay Zone’s development standards (which are currently being finalized) be followed in this project. Please see the discussion above (Article 4, Bullet 2) regarding the inclusion of the new SR 32 Overlay Zone’s standards in this PUD. – **This section has been modified to default to the State Highway 32 Overlay Zone standards.**

Section 5.2.H. – **This section has been modified to default to the State Highway 32 Overlay Zone standards.**

- It is suggested that the new SR 32 Overlay Zone’s development standards (which are currently being finalized) be followed in this project. Please see the discussion above (Article 4, Bullet 2) regarding the inclusion of the new SR 32 Overlay Zone’s standards in this PUD.
- Delete the comma after “Fourteen (14)”.
- Consider increasing the minimum building height for flat roofs to “Twenty (20) feet” in order to be consistent with the new SR 32 Overlay Zone’s standards.

Section 5.2. I. Is the minimum gross floor area requirement per building? Per tenant? Overall? Please clarify. If it is per tenant or building, please consider increasing to 5,000 square feet. – **The language was clarified so that the minimum square footage requirement is per building. The proposed minimum square footage is less than what is established in the State Highway 32 Overlay Zone, and this may be a discussion item at the APC meeting.**

Section 5.2.J.1. It is suggested that this proposed standard be deleted because it will be addressed in the new SR 32 Overlay Zone standards. – **Section removed**

Section 5.3. Mixed Use District.

- The Mixed Use District does not seem like a typical Mixed Use District in Westfield. It seems like a district that separately allows: 1) commercial uses, and 2) multi-family residential uses. There does not appear to be anything that encourages or requires the “mixing” or blending of the two different uses together. Please clarify the vision/intent of this district. As proposed, it seems like two very separate uses have been put together in one district and called “Mixed Use”. The Plan Commission may be okay with

this approach, but may wish to discuss this further. – The petitioner has stated to staff that this district promotes a blending of uses within a single district.

- The “Zone Map” does not distinguish specific districts within each PUD. It is suggested to delete the last sentence because it is a bit confusing and unnecessary because it was already addressed in the WHEREAS language. – Sentence modified to eliminate reference to the Zone Map changing
- It is suggested that the new SR 32 Overlay Zone standards (which are currently being finalized) supersede the requirements found in this section regarding setbacks, architectural standards, and other development standards. It may make sense to adopt the new SR 32 Overlay standards before approving the Springmill Trails PUD. Then, the proposed PUD Ordinance can be modified as necessary to accommodate the new SR 32 Overlay standards. The Plan Commission may wish to discuss this further. – PUD defaults to the State Highway 32 Overlay Zone standards, with some modifications

Section 5.3.B.3. Temporary buildings and job site trailers for construction purposes... Temporary buildings/trailers are not land uses and should not be included in a list of “Permitted Uses”. Suggest deleting. – Item removed from permitted use list

Section 5.3.B.4. Utilities, both regulated and unregulated (excludes offices and/or storage facilities). Utilities are not land uses and should not be included in a list of “Permitted Uses”. Suggest deleting. – Item removed from permitted use list

Section 5.3.B.6 Any amenity structure or facility... This seems like something that should be found in Covenants, Conditions & Restrictions, not a PUD Ordinance. Suggest deleting. – Item removed from permitted use list

Section 5.3.B.7. Home Occupations... The reference made to Section 3.1.D will likely change if the suggestion to default to the City’s Zoning Ordinance is followed. – Reference removed.

Section 5.3.E. The proposed standard is for “Minimum Development Plan Frontage on Road. Should it be “Minimum Tract Frontage on Road”? Please explain/clarify. – The petitioner has agreed to make the change.

Section 5.3.F.

- It is suggested that the new SR 32 Overlay Zone’s development standards (which are currently being finalized) be followed in this project. Please see the discussion above (Article 4, Bullet 2) regarding the inclusion of the new SR 32 Overlay Zone’s standards in this PUD. – PUD defaults to the State Highway 32 Overlay Zone standards, with some modifications

- Suggest deleting the notes “(zero (0) feet for interior lot lines)” in this section. It is unnecessary to include these notes because it is already established that the setback lines apply to the perimeter of the district. – Notes deleted

Section 5.3.F.1. Delete the note “(as measured from the existing right-of-way at the time of adoption of the Springmill Trails PUD)”. – Note deleted

Section 5.3.G. It is suggested that the new SR 32 Overlay Zone’s development standards (which are currently being finalized) be followed in this project. Please see the discussion above (Article 4, Bullet 2) regarding the inclusion of the new SR 32 Overlay Zone’s standards in this PUD. – The petitioner has agreed to remove this section and default to the City’s Zoning Ordinance.

Section 5.3.H.1. It is suggested that this proposed standard be deleted because it will be addressed in the new SR 32 Overlay Zone standards. – Section removed

Section 5.4. Architectural Standards. It is suggested that the new SR 32 Overlay Zone’s architectural standards (which are currently being finalized) be followed in this project. Please see the discussion above (Article 4, Bullet 2) regarding the inclusion of the new SR 32 Overlay Zone’s standards in this PUD. – PUD defaults to the State Highway 32 Overlay Zone standards, where applicable.

Section 5.4.A. The architectural standards included in this section are minimal. The Plan Commission may wish to discuss this further. – Building materials standards default to the Zoning Ordinance, including the State Highway 32 Overlay Zone

Section 5.4.A.1. This seems like something that should be found in Covenants, Conditions & Restrictions, not a PUD Ordinance. Suggest deleting. – Section removed

Section 5.4.A.3. In the third and fourth sentences, should the “shoulds” be “shalls”? Please confirm. – Section removed

Section 5.4.A.4. Define the terms “architectural theme” and “design vocabulary”. What are the standards that apply? – Terms removed, standard clarified.

Section 5.4.A.5. What are the streetscape standards? How do these landscaping standards work with the required “Road Frontage” shade tree requirements (found in the Landscaping Standards)? Please explain/clarify. Also, suggest deleting the last sentence, because it is true whether it is stated here or not. – Language simplified and clarified

Section 5.4.A.6. How do these monument signage requirements work with the Signage Standards? Please explain/clarify. – Language clarified that the monument sign materials are to match the character of the primary structures in the Mixed Use District.

Section 5.4.B.1. Delete the first sentence. This is a policy statement and not a standard. Also, please define or provide examples of what “special paving emphasis” is. – Section removed

Section 5.4.B.2. – Section removed. Defaults to the Zoning Ordinance.

- Is the centrally-located open space required? Please clarify intent of section.
- Define and/or provide standards for “four-sided architecture”.
- Delete the phrase “so that they also face important side streets”.
- Change “forty percent” to “forty (40) percent”.

Section 5.4.B.3. It has been suggested that this sentence is vague. It needs clarification and standards for the Structure Parking facility. – Language changed from using the phrase “harmonious with” to “similar to”

Section 5.4.B.4. If there is a twelve (12) feet sidewalk with a ten (10) foot unobstructed zone, then that potentially leaves only two (2) feet for outdoor eating areas (which are allowed per this standard). The remaining two (2) feet is likely not enough space for an outdoor eating area. Please clarify this standard. – The petitioner has agreed to clarify the language, requiring a minimum of a six (6) foot clearance for pedestrian circulation.

Section 5.4.C. The architectural standards included in this section are minimal. The Plan Commission may wish to discuss this further. – Building materials standards default to the Zoning Ordinance

Section 5.4.C.2. Is this a standard that applies to big box retailers only, or does it apply to all businesses? Please clarify. – Language clarified so that the standard applies to all businesses

Section 5.5. Additional Standards for Multi-Family Uses in the Mixed Use District.

- Unless there is a good reason to deviate from the City’s Zoning Ordinance, the City’s standards for multi-family development (most likely, MF-2) should serve as the PUD’s default standards. There is no need to repeat the City’s standards in the PUD Ordinance. To the extent there are any deviations from the Zoning Ordinance, the PUD should list any exceptions and include any further restrictions. – MF-2 listed as default
- The word “Additional” in the title implies that Sections 5.3 and 5.4 apply too. Is this correct? If so, it could be clarified, perhaps by deleting the word “Additional” and adding an item under Section 5.5 that states that the standards found in Sections 5.3 and 5.4 apply to Multi-Family uses. – Language clarified by removing the word “additional”
- The City’s Zoning Ordinance requires a minimum of twenty (20) percent green space in a multi-family project. The proposed Springmill Trails PUD does not include any green space requirements for a multi-family development. Please consider adopting and following the City’s standard for green space. The Plan Commission may wish to discuss

this further. – Standard included, requiring a minimum of 20% green space in the multi-family area(s) of the Mixed Use District.

- Check the formatting/numbering within this section. This report will use the references that were provided in the submittal. – Formatting corrected

Section 5.5.A. What acreage is the maximum density base on? Is it the acreage of the Mixed Use District? Please confirm. – Clarified that the density number is based on multi-family development and green space area

Section 5.5.I. Replace the phrase, “between buildings and” and replace with “from”. – Change made

Section 5.5. J. The proposed maximum building height for a Multi-Family building is fifty (50) feet. That is more than the standard found in the City’s MF-2 District, which is thirty-five (35) feet. – The maximum building height of multi-family dwellings may be a discussion item at the APC meeting.

Section 5.5.M.

- Recommend moving the “Development Amenities” section to the end of the Multi-Family section. – Section moved to the end of the Multi-Family section
- What are the development standards for the various listed amenities? – Standards are included in the PUD Ordinance. If standards are not listed for a specific amenity, then default to the Zoning Ordinance.
- Suggest rewording the last sentence to read as follows, “Picnic/barbecue areas and playgrounds qualify as amenities as long as they meet the following standards:” – Sentence removed

Section 5.5.M.1. Suggest rewording this standard to read as follows, “Picnic/barbecue area: A Picnic/barbecue area shall include at least one (1) barbecue grill and one (1) picnic table per fifty (50) dwelling units.” – Modification made

Section 5.5.M.2. Suggest rewording this standard to read as follows, “Large Playground: A Large Playground shall be a minimum of 5,000 square feet in area per 250 units. The square footage requirement includes safe fall zones. Play equipment shall include a variety of elements within a designated area, mulched with ADA and CPSC approved safety surfacing. A Large Playground shall include the following:” – Modification made

Section 5.5.M.3. Suggest rewording this standard to read as follows, “Small Playground: A Small Playground shall be a minimum of 2,000 square feet in area per 150 units. The square footage requirement includes safe fall zones. Play equipment shall include a variety of elements within a designated area, mulched with ADA and CPSC approved safety surfacing. A Small Playground shall include the following:” – Modification made

Section 5.5.O. Suggest moving this item to the beginning of the “Development Amenities” section, then listing the menu of amenity options (as listed in Section 5.5.M). Also, on the first line, replace the word “counts” with “count”. – Section moved to the beginning of the multi-family amenities section. Grammar correction made.

Section 5.5.P. Suggest renaming this to “Parking Lot Screening”, because that is what the following standards are describing. Also, the reference to “Article 9” should be “Article 16”. – Modification made

Section 5.5.P.1.

- Suggest rewording this standard to read as follows, “Parking lots and spaces viewable from a public street or adjacent to a single-family or multi-family district shall be screened by either an opaque wall or fence or by a solid hedge row, in addition to landscaping required in this Springmill Trails PUD. – Modification made
- What are the height and material requirements for the wall, fence, and hedge row? – Clarification added requiring a 3 foot opaque wall or fence or a solid hedge row for screening parking lots viewable from a public street or adjacent residential development

Section 5.5.P.2.

- Suggest rewording this standard to read as follows, “Parking lot screening shall be installed when parking spaces are located within ten (10) feet of residential dwellings.” – Modification made
- Does this apply when within ten (10) feet of both single-family and multi-family dwellings? If so, this standard should probably be clarified as such. – Standard would apply to both, single-family and multi-family dwellings

Section 5.5.Q.

- Suggest reformatting this standard as follows: – Reformatted
 1. Masonry shall be the exterior building material on thirty (30) percent of the elevation of all buildings, excluding openings, such as doors and windows, roofs, and the area within any dormer projecting from a roof.
 2. Masonry or Natural Materials shall be the exterior building material on the remaining exterior elevation of the building, excluding openings, such as doors and windows, roofs, and the area within any dormer projecting from a roof.
- For multi-family buildings, the City’s Zoning Ordinance requires a minimum of seventy-five (75) percent of each elevation be either brick or EIFS. – PUD requires a minimum of 30% brick on all sides of a multi-family building, with masonry or Natural Materials covering the remaining 70%. Vinyl siding is not a permitted material on Multi-Family dwellings in the PUD. The City’s Zoning Ordinance would allow vinyl on the remaining

25% of the elevation. The building material requirements for multi-family buildings may be a discussion item at the APC meeting.

Section 5.5.R. The proposed “Transportation Accessibility” section addresses items that are administered by the Westfield Public Works Department and are not land use issues. Suggest deleting this section from the PUD Ordinance. – Section removed. Defaults to the Zoning Ordinance.

Section 5.5.S.1. Because of the minimum twenty (20) feet of separation between buildings, isn’t this item addressed already? Suggest deleting this item. – Section removed.

Section 5.5.S.2. Suggest making the last sentence into a separate standard, and not including it with Section 5.5.S.2. – Reformatted

Section 5.5.S.3. Unless there is a good explanation as to what a “service facility” is and why it needs additional parking restrictions, this standard may not be necessary. This standard can probably be deleted. – Section removed.

Section 5.5.S.4. The items listed in this standard are typically included on a development plan drawing. Suggest deleting this standard. – Section removed.

Section 5.5.T. Unless there is a good reason to deviate from the City’s Zoning Ordinance, the City’s standards for accessory structures, fences and swimming pools should serve as the PUDs default standards. There is no need to repeat the City’s standards in the PUD Ordinance. To the extent there are any deviations from the Zoning Ordinance, the PUD should list any exceptions and include any further restrictions. This Section can probably be deleted. – Section removed. Defaults to the Zoning Ordinance.

Article 6. State Highway 32 Overlay Zone. Unless there is a good reason to deviate from the City’s Zoning Ordinance, these standards should be included and serve as the PUD’s default standards. To the extent there are any deviations from the Zoning Ordinance, the PUD should list any exceptions and include any further restrictions. This Article can probably be eliminated. – PUD defaults to the State Highway 32 Overlay Zone standards, with some modifications regarding site access, monument sign locations, and minimum building size.

It is suggested that the new SR 32 Overlay Zone standards (which are currently being finalized) supersede the requirements found in this section regarding setbacks, architectural standards, and other development standards. It may make sense to adopt the new SR 32 Overlay standards before approving the Springmill Trails PUD. Then, the proposed PUD Ordinance can be modified as necessary to accommodate the new SR 32 Overlay standards. The Plan Commission may wish to discuss this further.

Article 7. State Highway 32 Landscape Overlay Zone. These overlay requirements are being merged into the new SR 32 Overlay Zone standards. Unless there is a good reason to deviate from the City’s Zoning Ordinance, these standards should be included and serve as the PUD’s default standards. To the

extent there are any deviations from the Zoning Ordinance, the PUD should list any exceptions and include any further restrictions. This Article can probably be eliminated. – Section removed.

Article 8. Multi-Family Development Plan, Fencing, Accessory Building, Swimming Pools and Trash Receptacles. Unless there is a good reason to deviate from the City’s Zoning Ordinance, these standards should be included and serve as the PUD’s default standards. To the extent there are any deviations from the Zoning Ordinance, the PUD should list any exceptions and include any further restrictions. This Article can probably be eliminated. – Section removed. Defaults to the Zoning Ordinance.

Article 9. Off-Street Loading and Parking. Unless there is a good reason to deviate from the City’s Zoning Ordinance, the City’s standards for loading berths and off-street parking should serve as the PUD’s default standards. There is no need to repeat the City’s standards in the PUD Ordinance. To the extent there are any deviations from the Zoning Ordinance, the PUD should list any exceptions and include any further restrictions. Please explain any proposed differences from the City’s existing standards.

Section 9.2.A. Suggest replacing the last word in this section, “business”, with “user”. – Section removed.

Section 9.2.B. The proposed maximum distance from the main entrance for a parking space is six hundred (600) feet. That is more than the standard found in the City’s Off-Street Parking standards, which is three hundred (300) feet. The Plan Commission may wish to discuss this further. Also, what are the development and architectural standards for a Parking Garage? – Parking Garage language removed. **The maximum distance of a parking space from a business’ main entrance may be a discussion item at the APC meeting.**

Section 9.2.C. Please explain the methods and standards by which on-street parking will be allowed to count towards a parking count requirement. – Section removed.

Section 9.2. D. It is suggested that the eighty (80) percent rule is confusing. For example, what happens to the remaining twenty (20) percent of the required parking spaces? Please explain and clarify this section. – Language clarified. **Standard allows an 80% reduction in total required parking when providing collective parking for multiple uses**

Section 9.2.E. The proposed minimum length for a parallel parking space is twenty-two (22) feet. That is less than the standard found in the City’s Off-Street Parking standards, which is twenty-four (24) feet. Please explain why the City’s existing standard needs to be modified for this project. – Section removed. Defaults to the Zoning Ordinance.

Section 9.2. G. Does the proposed standard mean that parking lots associated single-family residential uses (such as a parking lot for a clubhouse, swimming pool, or other amenity) does not have to be curbed? Please clarify. – Language clarified. **Standard does not apply to residential dwellings.**

Section 9.2.H. The last sentence seems like something that should be found in Covenants, Conditions & Restrictions, not a PUD Ordinance. Suggest deleting. – Section removed.

Section 9.2.I. – Section removed.

- Suggest deleting the word “planned”.
- Define “Emergency Lighting”.
- In this section, refer to the “Lighting Standards” for standards.

Section 9.2.J. Please add the parking standard for “Manufacturing, fabricating and processing plants not engaged in retail trade” from the Zoning Ordinance. – Modification made

Section 9.2.J.1.c.

- Suggest wording the title, “Multi-Family Uses in the Mixed Use District:” – Modification made
- The proposed parking standards for multi-family uses seem high. The City’s Zoning Ordinance requires two (2) parking spaces per dwelling. Please explain the need for more parking. – The petitioner has agreed to default to the City’s Zoning Ordinance requirement for multi-family parking.

Section 9.2.J.8. The proposed parking ratio for office uses is one (1) space for each two hundred fifty (250) square feet of assignable office area. The City’s Zoning Ordinance requires one (1) space for each two hundred (200) square feet of assignable office area. Please explain the need for the difference in this parking standard. – The proposed standard requires fewer parking spaces than the City’s Zoning Ordinance requires for office uses. The proposal is consistent with similar requirements in neighboring jurisdictions.

Section 9.3.

- Suggest deleting the phrases, “To read as follows:” and “or structure which is to be erected or substantially altered and”. – Phrase removed
- Suggest replacing the phrase, “there shall be provided such” with “the following”. – Modification made
- Suggest deleting the phrase, “in accordance with”. – Modification made
- Suggest replacing the phrase, “set forth hereinafter:” with “shall apply:” – Modification made

Section 9.3.A. The proposed standard for locating bicycle parking is that it be within six hundred (600) feet of the main entrance to the building served. That is nearly 1/8 of a mile and seems unnecessarily far. Suggest reducing that standard to something much closer to the building’s entrance. – Language modified from 600 feet to 200 feet

Section 9.3.B.1.a. As proposed, bicycle parking is not required for Single-Family Attached dwellings. Consider requiring bicycle parking for these dwelling types. – Bicycle parking

requirements for single-family attached dwellings may be a discussion item at the APC meeting.

Section 9.3.B.4. This establishes a maximum number of bicycle parking spaces. Consider deleting or explain why this should be included in the PUD Ordinance. – Section relocated so that it applies only to multi-family bicycle parking. The proposed maximum number of bicycle parking spaces may be a discussion item at the APC meeting.

Article 10. Development Plan Review. Unless there is a good reason to deviate from the City's Zoning Ordinance, the City's standards for Development Plan Review should serve as the PUD's default standards. There is no need to repeat the City's standards in the PUD Ordinance. To the extent there are any deviations from the Zoning Ordinance, the PUD should list any exceptions and include any further restrictions. Please explain any proposed differences from the City's existing standards. – Section removed. Defaults to the Zoning Ordinance.

Article 11. Springmill Trails PUD – Table of Permitted Uses. Unless there is a good reason to deviate from the City's Zoning Ordinance, the permitted uses for the underlying zoning classifications should serve as the PUD's default list of permitted uses. To the extent there are any deviations from the Zoning Ordinance, the PUD should list any exceptions and include any further restrictions. Please explain any proposed differences from the City's existing standards.

Suggested Modifications:

- China & Glassware Shops = Allow in Market Center District – Modification made
- Coin Shops = Allow in Market Center District – Modification made
- Dentists = Allow in Market Center District – Modification made
- Distributors-Inside Storage = Allow in Commercial District – Modification made
- Electrical or non-polluting vehicle service, rental & sales = Allow in Mixed Use District and Commercial District – Modification made
- Electrical Supply Store = Allow in Market Center District (NOTE: this item is listed twice, once on Page 2 and once on Page 6). – Modification made
- Employment Agencies = Allow in Mixed Use District and Commercial District – Modification made
- Furrier Shops = Allow in Market Center District – Modification made
- Galleries = Allow in Market Center District – Modification made
- Greenhouse, Retail = Allow in Commercial District – Modification made
- Interior Decorating = Allow in Market Center District – Modification made
- Locksmith Shops = Allow in Mixed Use District and Commercial District – Modification made
- Tobacco Shops = Allow in Market Center District – Modification made
- Tool and Light Equipment Rental = Allow in Mixed Use District and Commercial District – Modification made

- Distributors – Outdoor Storage = This term needs to be defined; and screening requirements need to be established for the outdoor storage component – **Item removed from permitted use table**
- Kennels – Including Outdoor Runs = Allow in Commercial District as a Special Exception – **Item modified to allow Kennels without Outdoor Runs as a permitted use in the Commercial District; and Kennels with Outdoor Runs as a Special Exception in the Commercial District.**

General Comments:

- It is suggested that the Commercial District seems pretty wide open, in terms of the allowable uses. Please consider restricting the uses in this district and not allowing residential uses. – **The petitioner has indicated to staff that the Commercial District is planned to blend into the Mixed-Use District, further indicating that the listed residential uses could be blended amongst the two districts. This may be a discussion item at the APC meeting.**

Article 12. Principals and Standards of Design. Unless there is a good reason to deviate from the City's Zoning Ordinance, the City's Principals and Standards of Design should serve as the PUD's default standards. There is no need to repeat the City's standards in the PUD Ordinance. To the extent there are any deviations from the Zoning Ordinance, the PUD should list any exceptions and include any further restrictions. Please explain any proposed differences from the City's existing standards. – **Section removed. Defaults to the Zoning Ordinance.**

Section 12.7.A Open Space.

- The proposed standard refers to "open space provisions" in Article 17. Article 17 in the proposed PUD Ordinance does not contain any open space information. Please explain/clarify this situation. – **Open Space is required in the Residential Districts (minimum of 21% per district), and in the Multi-Family area (minimum of 20%).**
- Please provide information on what the open space numbers (acreage and percentages) are for the Springmill Trails PUD property, not including the acreage east of Springmill Road. – **The acreage east of Springmill Road is not included in the Springmill Trails PUD and is not included in any of the open space calculations**

Article 13. Standards of Improvement. Unless there is a good reason to deviate from the City's Zoning Ordinance, the City's Standards of Improvement should serve as the PUD's default standards. There is no need to repeat the City's standards in the PUD Ordinance. To the extent there are any deviations from the Zoning Ordinance, the PUD should list any exceptions and include any further restrictions. Please explain any proposed differences from the City's existing standards. – **Section removed. Defaults to the Zoning Ordinance.**

Article 14. Landscaping Standards. Unless there is a good reason to deviate from the City's Zoning Ordinance, the City's standards for Landscaping should serve as the PUD's default standards. There is no

need to repeat the City's standards in the PUD Ordinance. To the extent there are any deviations from the Zoning Ordinance, the PUD should list any exceptions and include any further restrictions. Please explain any proposed differences from the City's existing standards. – PUD generally defaults to the City's Landscaping Standards, with a few listed exceptions.

Article 15. Lighting Standards. Unless there is a good reason to deviate from the City's Zoning Ordinance, the City's standards for Lighting should serve as the PUD's default standards. There is no need to repeat the City's standards in the PUD Ordinance. To the extent there are any deviations from the Zoning Ordinance, the PUD should list any exceptions and include any further restrictions. Please explain any proposed differences from the City's existing standards. – Section removed. Defaults to the Zoning Ordinance.

Article 16. Sign Standards. Unless there is a good reason to deviate from the City's Zoning Ordinance, the City's standards for Signs should serve as the PUD's default standards. There is no need to repeat the City's standards in the PUD Ordinance. To the extent there are any deviations from the Zoning Ordinance, the PUD should list any exceptions and include any further restrictions. Please explain any proposed differences from the City's existing standards. – PUD generally defaults to the City's Sign Standards, with a few listed exceptions.

Article 17. Acreage, Residential Units and Density Statistics. The proposed information in Exhibit 17 is significantly less than that which was provided in the Eagletown PUD. Please provide the same detailed information that was provided in the original Eagletown PUD proposal for this exhibit, including: maximum number of units in each district (by type); the maximum/minimum square footage in the commercial areas (by type); and the amount of open space in each district (acreage). – Density numbers included for Residential District 1, Residential District 2, and the Multi-Family standards; and open space requirements established by percentage in each residential district. The petitioner has indicated to staff that the commercial square footage numbers are anticipated to be the same as what is listed in the existing Eagletown PUD Ordinance.

Article 18. Procedural Provisions. It is suggested that Sections 18.1, 18.2, 18.3, 18.4, 18.5, and 18.6 be deleted. – Section removed. Defaults to the Zoning Ordinance.

Exhibit B. Please provide an 11x17 copy of the map. – Exhibits submitted in a format that can be printed at 11x17

Exhibit C. Please provide an 11x17 copy of the map. – Exhibits submitted in a format that can be printed at 11x17

Exhibit D. Please provide an 11x17 copy of the map. – Exhibits submitted in a format that can be printed at 11x17